

## DOWNTOWN COMMISSION RESULTS

Office of the Director  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-7795  
(614) 645-6675 (FAX)

**Tuesday, August 22, 2017**

**77 N. Front Street, STAT Room (Lower Level)**

Planning Division  
50 W. Gay St.  
Columbus, Ohio 43215-9040  
(614) 645-8664

Downtown Commission  
Daniel J. Thomas (Staff)  
Urban Design Manager  
(614) 645-8404  
[djthomas@columbus.gov](mailto:djthomas@columbus.gov)

- I. Attendance** 5:20  
Present: Steve Wittmann (Chair); Otto Beatty, Jr.; Michael Brown; Tedd Hardesty;  
Kyle Katz;; Robert Loversidge; Mike Lusk; Jana Maniace ; Danni Palmore

Absent: None

City Staff: Daniel Thomas; Dan Morgan; Ashley Senn, Kelly Scocco

- II. Approval of the July 25, 2017 Downtown Commission Meeting Results**  
Motion to approve (9-0) KK, OB

**III. Conceptual Reviews and Updates**

**Case #1 17-8-1C** 7:45

**Address:** 350 E. Broad Street

**Applicant and Design Professional :** John Behal (Behal Sampson Dietz)

**Property Owner:** EB 2016 LLC (Bob Meyers)

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for 5-story residential building over a 1½ story parking structure. Project includes demolition of existing 5-story office building and surface parking.

**Discussion:** JB - existing building doesn't fill the whole site. Looked at renovating but it has a lot of issues and best option is to demolish and build new. 1 or 1½ level of parking above grade and 5 stories of apartments above, a mix of studios and one bedrooms. 55 to 65 units. Building amenities (lobby and other activity) along Broad St. Need whole width of site for parking plate. Decorative iron work along Grant Ave. Possibly engaging an artist. Initial submission had yellow parts of façade. Lately, have been working on other options, more neutral palate, combination of brushed and shiny metal panels in different planes. 9 x 9 ft. window system. Use of the entire site for the building. Height is sensitive to the context.

KK – current building is functionally obsolete. Likes switch away from yellow. Would like Grant façade to be more engaging at street level – suggests use of CCAD students. JM – create shallow storefront? Key corner for pedestrians. OB – traffic issues in terms of proximity to Broad and Grant intersection. Work things out with Traffic. SERS is already a problem. RL – could you come in from the SERS driveway?

SW – standard for demolition is what is proposed is better than what is there now and

this meets that. MB – Broad St. activity isn't really there yet. Could it be more? Shop to activate the street? Possibly go higher. RL – like the not yellow – possibly a little bland. Pick up color schemes from the building next door, maybe an accent at the front door. BM – agrees – rendering isn't quite what he had in mind. Different planes, three levels of surface. Will look at decorative metal screening in terms of color. SW – likes screening, does have transparency. Lighting at night. BM – have Broad St reflect on adjacent SERS park. KK – create outdoor gallery. ML – entry should be looked at. JB – vagrancy is an issue there. JM – balconies? - JB there might be a few. Looking for windows on the west side. JB – questions about demolition process. SW – surety particularly related to finalized drawings. Include lighting, signage.

**Result:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

**Case #2 17-8-2C**

24:50

**Address:** 555 W. Goodale Street

**Applicant:** WC Goodale LLC

**Design Professional :** : Brad Parish, Architectural Alliance

**Attorney:** Scott Ziance, Vorys

**Property Owner:** White Castle Management Co.

**Request:**

Conceptual Review of Master Plan for an 20 acre +/- mixed use development.

**Discussion:** WC – excited to reinvest in the property which it has owned for 80 years. We hope to be staying at least another 80 years with this new project. This will be special and unique. New images brought. BP – have been working as a team for over a year. Master plan for a mixed use - live / work environment. Somewhat remote from downtown but with great views of downtown. Components that are office, residential and a later phase that is market driven. Community spaces are important to WC as a destination site. Presentation of site components., including corporate HQ with community center. There will be two park spaces, one an anchor in front of HQ. Includes amphitheater gathering place and boulevard. With parallel parking to help for events. Boulevard separates residential and office components. Desire for 24/7 activity and overlap parking. At the western end of the Boulevard will be an overlook into the Olentangy River. Will also look back to the Community Center – an amenity for both office and residential users and also outside groups. There will be a roof terrace. The WC Bldg. will be 4 stories, also with a roof terrace. Site will use elevation changes putting some parking in the flood plain. I-670 is elevated so drivers will see building instead of parking.

Main office creates axis with primary entrance, has great views and creates sound buffer for residences from freeway. RL – road going under the freeway? BP – goes to the adjacent property. A – ingress and egress to the site has been a main focus. Connectivity has been important. Part of ED agreement access has been provided.

Main entrance is light at Goodale entrance ramp to SR315. There are two other curb cuts currently. Two right ins, right outs. MB – the river is highly valuable and the plan looks like it is undervalued. The river is the sweet spot of the project. Go bigger there if you can. Not as suburban. JM – try to consolidate the parking and accentuate the green spaces that you are creating. The southern end of the site is in the floodplain, which is why the buildings are off of that area. RL – I think the plan is really great and I don't miss the HQ building but I think it would be wonderful if there were some piece of that. Use a piece of a White Castle. Integrate it into a pavilion. Or use some of the technology that

helped White Castle become White Castle. ML – celebrate the heritage. JM – maybe in the community center. RL – I worry a little about the traffic on Goodale, people are really going fast there. And its curved. SW – there has been a light there. Integrate a little bit of retail or restaurant, possibly tying in with community center. TH – thinking about pedestrian connectivity off site. BP – working on bike and walking path. JM – possible reuse of existing material in an iconic way. ML – timing and phasing? WC – New White Castle first while keeping the existing one in use, then main access drive, then demolition. After that multi-family development, then rear office building and front market force building that is up front on the site.

**Result:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

**Case #3 17-8-3C**

47:00

**Location:** 154 N. Third St., 118 E. Long St. & 134 E. Long St. and spaces between buildings  
**Appl. and Design Professional :** Jonathan Barnes Architecture and Design c/o Sarah Mackert  
**Property Owner:** Schottenstein Property Group

**Request:**

Conceptual Review for Mixed Use Development – Residential, Retail and Parking at N. Third and E. Long.

**Discussion:** JB - With all of the residential development along Long, there will be a certain capacity for retail. Look at Pins Mechanical. Great opportunity for infill development. Third St. building is 5 stories, about 15,000 sf. 118 Long is 2 stories 8000 sf and 134 is 4 stories and 13,000 sf. Upper floors to residential with commercial on the ground floor. See how the retail plays out. Apartments will 2 & 1 bedroom and studios. We're treating these buildings as a small community. Third St. – 46 apartments, addition will roughly match the height of the Third St. building. There will be about 38 parking spaces in all. Idea is to connect all three buildings by space above parking. Open air corridors with access to apartments. Amenity decks. Don't really know what they will be like at this time. We do not have control of the car rental building. We'd like to have it. The access corridors connect to elevator and are covered but open. No A/C is provided. The other buildings on Long St. will have their own circulation and new stairs. RL – awesome. Suspected that 134 is a lot older than originally thought and suggests you look into that. Pay extra attention to it from a preservation standpoint. JB – completely encased in granulate. Something modern next to the old.

**Result:** Conceptual review only, no vote taken.

**Case #4 17-8-4C**

1:01:00

**Project:** *Millennial Tower* **Location:** Southwest corner of Front and Rich Streets  
**Applicant and Design Professionals:** Urban Design LLC, David Rectenwald, AIA  
**Property Owner:** Bicentennial Plaza Holding Company, Ltd., et.al.  
Bill Schottenstein (A)

**Attorney:** Joseph A. Sugar

**Request:**

Update (Conceptual) and review of - major mixed-use retail / office / residential & parking building (27 stories) project at Front and Rich Streets in the River South District centered around A.) More detailed material identification and B.) Revised electronic board display.  
CC3359.05(C)1)

*The Millennial Tower was presented to the Commission in May 2016 and June 2017. The applicant is*

*anticipates going to architecture firm for more finalized drawings and seeks Commission support.*

**Discussion:** DR went over the latest plans. Front St. elevation with electronic display board and also, just distributed, a scrim vinyl advertising over galvanized screened parking area. The other sides of parking for the rest of building will be the galvanized screen. Model displayed. A - New LED only faces the Lazarus garage and slightly wraps the corner. Will project out a little bit so it can be seen from down the street. Idea is to create activity. The LED will only be 14 ft. high. We would like to be able to have the screen on the other sides with a (graphic) treatment that will make the building look more interesting (similar to the original rendering). SW – clarification as to what sides have what – advertising vs abstract graphics. These graphic sides could be changed out to add interest. LED wraps only slightly around the corner. JM, RL – clarification. RL – maybe leaving a band of mesh at top and bottom, instead of covering it all up. A – want to cover parking. JM – like that you are keeping the commercial component to Front St. and doing something creative and dynamic on the other sides. Could be other options with lighting, for example. KK – seems to me that the focus today is on the Front St. façade. What about integrating the images to the design. What must they look like to have them work with the building. SW – if there is an LED on this building I will vote no. Period. I will not vote for advertising screens on parking garages. There many other garages downtown that do not have them. Other ways to make garage interesting. I don't want to see advertising built into a brand new building. A parking structure is a parking structure. I know that you know how to make this look compatible. I would vote no on advertising. We have guidelines that stat, #1 to be discouraged and #2, two places where they can go, one is Nationwide Blvd. and the other is along High St. This is a clear step out of our guidelines. Don't think it is appropriate. Too much light. That area is developing a character of its own. Quite a residential area with a border of offices along the river. This area is working out well. This is not compatible. A - you have your right to vote no. We think this is an incredibly important element to push the retail. We have a 600 car garage across the street, that is what we are playing to. Front St. is a very mixed use street. We want to be able to pull people from down the street. Business First editorial after the last meeting. The editor thought that the whole thing should be video. There are different end of the spectrum. Hopefully we can meet somewhere in the middle to make the retail be successful. The light is not going to be impactful the way we've limited it and the way it is on Front St. If anything, you are lighting the parking garage across the street. This will make things safer at night.

KK – I'm less dogmatic on the LED. On a functional basis, this building is gargantuan in relationship to other buildings. The light going onto the garage doesn't bother me. I don't know how much attention you will get. 14 ft. high and 40 ft. in the air. I'd love to see the parking hidden in an ingenious fashion that lends to the design of the building. A – studies show that the attention span of people have diminished to seconds. You need something that changes and catches the eye.

RL – I think it would be worth looking at the Lazarus garage and see what this would look like 40 feet up and what it would look like by people driving down the street. I'm not sure they are going to see anything other than bright lights that are blinking. – A – I'm going for people that are walking down the street. The height is over the LC apartments. I will see something from State and Front and also the other way. Mound St. and the Brewery District.

TH – not totally against LED but I'm concerned about the height of the band. Lack of articulation on the ground level. There will also be street trees. What do you experience at the ground level. How do you activate the first and second levels? Signage, etc. JM – building is massive. Entry is only one level. A – both first and second levels are 20 ft. The entrance will be pronounced with massive stair. Will be clear glass to see activity. LED has to be at its planned level or it won't be seen. DR – metal canopy projects about 7 ft.

DP – we worked very hard on the guidelines which doesn't want LEDs on Front St. Concerned about precedence. A – there is not another building like this. Designing a building for the future, not looking in the rear view mirror, such as the City Center mall. We have to look forward. 20, 30 years into the future. RL – Retail mix? A – Retail (4 to 8) on both levels, including community areas. Need something to draw people in so that they understand what is there. It is more than just walking by at the pedestrian level. Views from second level will be nice. In answer to ML, I do see food tenants. We considered balcony space on the second level but we need the square footage density. (To RL), tenants, hotel guests, office workers, etc. will park in the garage. Can also support other buildings in the vicinity. RL – mostly people who know where they are going. Does the parking entrance need to be on Front St.? A - we don't have a choice. Cherry is too narrow, Ludlow is the only one for service.

KK – are you far enough along to determine other signage for the building? A – no, up to the tenants. We will want a certain amount of coordination and contemporary expression. KK – can LED be translated to something that features (advertises) the 4 to 8 tenants? Can it be more static? A – don't think so. Need something that catches the eye. Get people off of their personal devices, to look up. Also to advertise events in the area – Commons, Riverfront. We don't just want people to come to the building, we want them to come to the area. We're the lynch pin between High St. and river. Could also be benefits for other community announcements such as museum. RL – off premise advertising? A – more for the internal building. OB – this is a struggle for me. What do we do for people coming from outside the city to make it exciting? MB – we just went to Toronto. We didn't see anything like these bands. There were many cranes and many very tall buildings – without LEDs. I love the building and I want it to happen. We're not arguing about the building, but rather the "finger nail polish". This is a buildable building and a good project. We're only arguing about one element. A – the LEDs are in other cities such as New York and Philadelphia. We need to make Columbus more walkable.

SW – wrap up. SM – sympathize that you want this to be an amazing project. I don't believe that this is the right direction. The Scioto Mile has no big graphics. Good design is what is important. TH – wants you to succeed. Think about the street level zone more than 40 ft. up. KK – check the future of Cherry St. RL – next time there should be streetscape, which should have an impact. A – other drawings are in the process, but this is a determining factor, its integrated. RL – we like the project.

**Result:** Conceptual only, no vote taken.

#### **IV. Certificate of Appropriateness**

##### **Case #5 17-8-5**

1:36:30

**Location:** Southeast corner of Grant Ave. and Rich St. (371 E. Rich St.)

**Applicant:** The Daimler Group – Todd Sloan

**Design Professionals:** Mode Architects

Faris Planning & Design – Land Planning, Landscape Architecture

EMH&T – Civil Engineers

**Property Owner:** Franklin Health Corp. (OhioHealth Corp. Real Estate)

##### **Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for construction of a 6-story garage 1,050-space facility with park reserve area at corner of Grant and Rich for future use. CC3359.05(C)1

**Discussion:** TS – overview of other OhioHealth projects in area. Need for parking and to put employees in one location. The site is currently an employee surface lot. Would like to hold vacant lot for future development. Could be residential, could be offices / medical services. The park will allow flexibility related to their needs. RL – mentioned the buildings that were demolished across from the hospital. Why not an employee parking garage there? TS – the plan right now is for health services as Grant becomes the primary downtown hospital. KK – move for acceptance. DP – 2<sup>nd</sup>. TS – there have been some revised submissions, south side of the building, 2 hour fire rated wall. Parking to the east is leased, not owned. Still buildable. East façade will have EIFS material (buff color) as well as brick. Same material as 323 Town St. There will also be a rotunda as in other buildings on campus. Would like to come back for exterior lighting and signage. KK – amend motion to include coming back for signage, lighting and landscape plan in full. Screen on Cherry was added for security. South wall will be poured concrete with sand blast finish. No EIFS where the public can be adjacent to it.

**Result:** Motion to approve. Applicant to bring back lighting and signage. (8-1-0) Hardesty abstaining

**Case #6 17-8-6**

**Address:** 231 N. Fifth Street    **Ebb & Float**

1:49

**Applicant & Architect:** Darin Ranker, Carney Ranker Architects, Ltd.

**Property Owner:** Columbus Central Properties, Ltd.

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Exterior Improvements to existing building.

**Discussion:** Staff – located in what used to be called the warehouse district. Used to be a printing office. A – would like to remove plywood and add glazing to garage door space. Store front, dark bronze. RL – consider making the opening more like a glass garage door – more in keeping with the industrial nature of the area. A – will check with tenants. RL – consider painting the side of the building and also replacing the exposed conduit sconce light. SW – schedule? Do these small building as well as we can. KK – give this a warehouse aesthetic. MB – I find that this stuff is within the guidelines. RL – paint the side to match the brick on the front. KK – move that the project be approved as per changes specified. RL - Submit to staff. If that is a problem, call us back. MB – motion to accept with conditions- KK – 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**Result:** Motion to approve with the following conditions: (9-0)

1. Redesign of larger opening to be reflective of glass garage door
2. New sconce lighting, hiding conduit
3. Painting of side wall from white to color that matches brick

To be sent to staff for verification prior to the issuance of CoA

**Case #7 17-8-7**

**Address:** 340 E. Gay Street

1:58:45

**Applicant:** Matt Rootes, Co-owner of Pat and Gracie's Kitchen + Tavern

**Property Owner:** Randy Walker

**Attorney:** Ed Hastie

**Design Professional:** Neil Loemker (Neil's Designs, LLC.)

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for Sign and Fascia of Renovated Restaurant



**Discussion:** Pat and Gracie's Kitchen + Tavern will be opening a second location, the original is in Graceland Shopping Center. Initially, they planned to have their entire fascia clad in reclaimed barn wood, but they have decided to make the barn wood smaller, making it part of the sign. The rest of the sign would be aluminum with the name cut out and back lit with red LED. RL – the new proposal is better. The awning will not be done at this point in time and will probably come back for approval in the spring. TH – move to approve, KK – 2<sup>nd</sup>. SW – is this detailed enough? MR – 10' x 5' aluminum. The wood will be 3' on the sides of the metal plate.

**Result:** Motion to approve (9-0)

**Case #8 17-8-8**

2:02:10

**Location:** Nationwide Arena

**Applicant:** Eric Hoy, Columbus Sign Co. for the Columbus Blue Jackets

**Property Owner:** Franklin County Convention Facilities Authority

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness to change out skyline graphics. CC3359.05(C)1)

**Discussion:** RL – moves for approval, KK – 2<sup>nd</sup>. SW – this is an improvement over what is currently there.

**Result:** Motion to approve (9-0).

**Case #9 17-8-9**

2:03:40

**Address:** 170 N. Marconi Boulevard

**Applicant and Property Owner:** Steve Lark, Nationwide Realty Investors

**Design Professional:** Tony Roell, MKSK

**Request:**

Certificate of Appropriateness for the demolition of a parking garage and its replacement with temporary surface parking.

**Discussion:**

Jim Rost, NRI. – KK – move to approve. RL – I can't wait for this garage to be gone. What is the nature of this lot – is it public, is it for employees. Who parks here? How do you pay, is there a kiosk? JR – mostly monthly parkers and there will also be pay and display with two machines. (locations identified). KK – do you have a long term objective with this site, other than parking. JR – we see this as a temporary solution, but I can't put a time line on it. The current garage is not salvageable. There is also a dearth of parking in the area. This is a temporary solution. JM – landscaping. JR – also leaving some of the walls. RL – this is in Zone A, pay parking is not allowed. Is there some form of grandfather status since it was a pay garage? MB – has City condemned? JR – already has code violations. SW – I'm all in favor of this but are we able to allow this? RL – it was a pay structure, which is allowed anywhere downtown. I don't think a pay surface lot is allowed. Can we grant a variance to our ordinance? I appreciate the fact that you are building a temporary lot to very high standards. JR – would like to get this started before bad weather starts. KK – do what we going to do and have a contingency. Paint the walls. (buff color). JR – this will be a permeable paved surface, not too adaptable to interior trees. Emphasis on perimeter landscaping, particularly on Spring and Marconi and trees at four corners. RL – City Streetscape Standards A – not at this time. Won't impede into City R.O.W. Curb cut on Spring St. will be maintained, entrance will be walled. SW – approve subject to clarification of Accessory Parking provision. JR – we would like to know as

soon as you would come to that determination. KK – let’s look as this as a temporary parking solution and have NRI come pack in 5 years. RL – curb cut to nowhere looks bad. JR – wishes to stay away from R.O.W. RL – agrees with difficulty with this process. Billboards will be taken down. Come back for signage.

**Result:** Motion to approve subject to clarification of Accessory Parking provision. (8-0)

## **V. Business / Discussion**

**Motorist R.O.W.** – Discussion, agree to wait for this to come back when the applicant comes back for the Commission for larger approvals. Keeping public intent / access, lighting, materials, landscaping, dimensions will all factor in. 2:14

### **Public Forum**

Staff Certificates of Appropriateness have been issued since last notification (July 20, 2017)

Ad Mural – ***Bold & Italics***

1. 266 N Fourth St. – Ringside signage
2. 212 N Grant Ave. – FinishMaster Sign
3. 216 Cleveland Ave. – FinishMaster Sign
4. ***60 E. Spring St. – Netflix ad mural***
5. ***60 E. Spring – Car To Go ad mural***
6. 21 E. State – Serendipity Labs Sign
7. N Third & Elm – AEP parking
8. 204 N Fourth St. – Parking improvements
9. ***260 S. Fourth St. – Maker’ Mark ad mural***
10. 42 E. Long St. – Roofing
11. ***265 Neil Ave. – Diamond Exchange ad mural***
12. 268 S. Fourth St. – Mikey’s Late Nite Pizza – Sidewalk café referral
13. 400 N. High St. – Convention Center banners
14. ***154 N. Third St. – Maker’s Mark ad mural***
15. 401 E. Mound St. – awnings

**Next regular meeting will be on September 26, 2017, the fourth Tuesday of the month (four weeks away).**

**If you have questions concerning this agenda, please contact Daniel Thomas, Urban Design Manager, Planning Division at 614-645-8404. 2:19:20**